

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
 Sadik Huseny (Bar No. 224659)
 sadik.huseny@lw.com
 Steven M. Bauer (Bar No. 135067)
 steven.bauer@lw.com
 Amit Makker (Bar No. 280747)
 amit.makker@lw.com
 Shannon D. Lankenau (Bar No. 294263)
 shannon.lankenau@lw.com
 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: 415.391.0600
 Facsimile: 415.395.8095

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
 Melissa Arbus Sherry (*pro hac vice*)
 melissa.sherry@lw.com
 Richard P. Bress (*pro hac vice*)
 rick.bress@lw.com
 Anne W. Robinson (*pro hac vice*)
 anne.robinson@lw.com
 Tyce R. Walters (*pro hac vice*)
 tyce.walters@lw.com
 Gemma Donofrio (*pro hac vice*)
 gemma.donofrio@lw.com
 Christine C. Smith (*pro hac vice*)
 christine.smith@lw.com
 555 Eleventh Street NW, Suite 1000
 Washington, D.C. 20004
 Telephone: 202.637.2200
 Facsimile: 202.637.2201

LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR
 CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW
 Kristen Clarke (*pro hac vice*)
 kclarke@lawyerscommittee.org
 Jon M. Greenbaum (Bar No. 166733)
 jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org
 Ezra D. Rosenberg (*pro hac vice*)
 erosenberg@lawyerscommittee.org
 Ajay P. Saini (*pro hac vice*)
 asaini@lawyerscommittee.org
 Maryum Jordan (Bar No. 325447)
 mjordan@lawyerscommittee.org
 Pooja Chaudhuri (Bar No. 314847)
 pchaudhuri@lawyerscommittee.org
 1500 K Street NW, Suite 900
 Washington, D.C. 20005
 Telephone: 202.662.8600
 Facsimile: 202.783.0857

*Additional counsel and representation
 information listed in signature block*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WILBUR L. ROSS, JR., et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 5:20-cv-05799-LHK

**PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO
 EMERGENCY MOTION FOR A
 PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Place: Courtroom 8
 Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh

Pursuant to the Court’s December 16, 2020 Order (ECF No. 386), Plaintiffs hereby respectfully submit their Response to Defendants’ Emergency Motion for a Protective Order (“Motion”).

The Court granted Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel—and re-granted it, over Defendants’ motion for reconsideration—because Defendants had failed to comply with the Court’s scheduling order, had failed to produce relevant materials, and had even failed to provide Plaintiffs with information enabling Plaintiffs to understand what documents Defendants had (and where) that would provide Plaintiffs and the Court with basic, critical information about the claims in this case, and allow Plaintiffs to appropriately craft written discovery and proceed with fact depositions. On this latter point, over Defendants’ strident objections, the Court allowed Plaintiffs to obtain Rule 30(b)(6) testimony from the Defendants regarding limited, document-related topics, granting:

an additional Rule 30(b)(6) witness on the limited topics of **Defendants’** retention, organization, collection, review, and production of documents and data, as well as the search functionalities and capabilities of **Defendants’** various databases, so that Plaintiffs have definitive, sworn answers regarding key document production issues in this case, and meaningful guidance regarding how **Defendants** retain, manage, and organize data and how they are collecting and producing documents in this litigation[.]

ECF No. 380 (emphasis added).

Given this clear context and clear language, Plaintiffs are perplexed by Defendants’ motion. The Court’s Order is clear as to the topics at issue, and that it covers the Defendants—*plural*—in this case. Plaintiffs’ six deposition topics took care to track the Court’s language almost verbatim. Defendants never objected to or asked for reconsideration of this specific ruling from the Court (and in fact specifically said they would comply with it), and have never even issued written objections to the deposition notice. Instead, on the evening of December 15—the day before the scheduled deposition of December 16, which Plaintiffs had agreed to move the deposition to Thursday, December 17 to allow Defendants more time to prepare—Defendants emailed Plaintiffs “objecting” to providing a witness for the Commerce Department and unilaterally declaring that they “intend to provide a witness” on a set of revised and significantly narrower topics than those ordered by the Court and noticed by Plaintiffs. Mot., Ex.

1 4. Plaintiffs believe that Defendants’ unilateral declarations over what their witness would and
 2 would not testify to are a far cry from a “good faith” attempt to clarify the topics of the
 3 deposition, and instead exhibited defiance of the Court’s orders. *See* Mot. at 7. And their
 4 attempt to seek clarification now, which actually amounts to drastically limiting the Rule
 5 30(b)(6) testimony that was only granted because of Defendants’ discovery failings in the very
 6 first place, should be rejected.

7 ***1. Plaintiffs’ Topics Are Consistent with the Court’s Order and Narrowly Focused on***
 8 ***the Issues in this Case.*** The topics for this deposition are expressly set forth in this Court’s
 9 Order. ECF No. 380. After Defendants complained that the scope of Plaintiffs’ requests was too
 10 broad because it potentially implicated documents and data entirely unrelated to the census,
 11 Plaintiffs agreed—with Defendants understanding—to amend their notice to clarify that the
 12 scope of their requests is limited to documents and data relevant to this case and specifically
 13 Plaintiffs’ Requests for Production. This was unnecessary (the Rule 30(b)(6) topics were by
 14 definition limited to the documents and issues relevant to this case), but Plaintiffs went along,
 15 and did precisely what they agreed to do. Mot., Ex. 3. Defendants now complain that Plaintiffs
 16 made no attempt to “narrow these topics to the ‘document production issues in this case.’” Mot.
 17 at 5. To the contrary, Plaintiffs specifically narrowed every one of the topics to the document
 18 requests in this case, which of course do not exist in isolation but are tethered to Plaintiffs’
 19 claims in the Second Amended Complaint and limited to what is relevant to prove such claims.
 20 Defendants were ordered to produce a witness to testify about how Defendants retain, manage,
 21 and organize data so that Plaintiffs can effectively seek further discovery in this case—and that is
 22 exactly what Plaintiffs’ topics cover.

23 Defendants, however, seek to pick and choose amongst the requests for production that
 24 they prefer, and claim that the Court’s Order was limited to just 13 specific RFPs. There is zero
 25 support for this—and to allow this limitation would improperly omit critical Requests for
 26 Production that are clearly within the scope of what the Court ordered. For example, Defendants
 27 omit entirely topics related to Plaintiffs’ second and third Requests for Production, which seek
 28 documents showing the accuracy of Defendants’ assertions of a 99.98% completion rate and

documents showing other metrics (other than completion rates) that Defendants used to measure the progress, performance, or quality of the census. Certainly, the Court’s Order permits Plaintiffs to seek information about the types of metrics Defendants use to measure the progress, performance, and quality of the census, where such data is stored, how it can be accessed, and whether it will be produced in this litigation. Similarly, Defendants do not include Plaintiffs’ twelfth Request for Production, which seeks communications forwarded to enumerators’ NRFU iPhones from senior Bureau management. Again, the Court’s Order unequivocally allows Plaintiffs to seek information about where such communications are kept, how they might be accessed, and whether they will be produced in this litigation.

2. The Court Ordered and Plaintiffs Noticed the Deposition of Defendants.

Defendants’ insistence that the Court’s Order only allowed Plaintiffs to choose one of the “Defendants” is plainly inconsistent with the Order itself, which requires an additional deposition of *Defendants*—plural. At the parties’ December 14 meet and confer, Plaintiffs rejected Defendants’ notion that the Court had somehow ordered a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition for the Census Bureau alone. The Department of Commerce is unquestionably involved in the census. For that reason, it is a named Defendant in this case and it is required to produce documents in response to Plaintiffs’ requests.

Per the Court’s Order, Plaintiffs are entitled to seek information from Defendants’ Rule 30(b)(6) witness regarding how both agencies are collecting and producing documents in this litigation, including in response to every Request for Production Plaintiffs have served. For example, Plaintiffs’ Request for Production No. 21 seeks documents and communications to or from Secretary Ross regarding the 2020 Census. Moreover, Plaintiffs’ Request for Production No. 19 seeks documents regarding the Replan’s effects or potential effects on differential undercounts of hard-to-count populations. Plaintiffs are entitled to ask Defendants’ 30(b)(6) witness where that information is retained, how it is organized and managed, how it is being collected, reviewed, and produced in this case, and what specific databases might contain this information—regardless of whether the information is with the Census Bureau or the Department of Commerce.

1 If Defendants' quibble is merely formalistic, Plaintiffs will happily serve two separate
 2 Rule 30(b)(6) notices on the Census Bureau and the Department of Commerce, and take two
 3 Rule 30(b)(6) depositions—one for each entity. Indeed, Defendants offered to provide a
 4 declaration from the Department of Commerce responding to the noticed topics in narrative
 5 form. To date, Defendants have not provided such a declaration, and Plaintiffs have of course
 6 not agreed to accept any such alternative (nor has the Court). In order to comply with the
 7 Court's order that this deposition be taken no later than December 17, Plaintiffs have no choice
 8 but to forge ahead with the deposition topics covering the Department of Commerce. Given
 9 Defendants' insistence that the Department of Commerce has little in the way of information
 10 responsive to Plaintiffs' notice, it should not be burdensome to educate and prepare Defendants'
 11 witness on those limited topics (as is customary for Rule 30(b)(6) depositions).

12 Plaintiffs respectfully request that Defendants' Motion be denied and that they be
 13 required to produce one or more Rule 30(b)(6) witnesses to testify on the topics set forth in the
 14 Court's Order and Plaintiffs' Amended Notice.

15
 16 Dated: December 16, 2020

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

17 By: /s/ Sadik Huseny
 18 Sadik Huseny

19 Sadik Huseny (Bar No. 224659)
 20 sadik.huseny@lw.com
 21 Steven M. Bauer (Bar No. 135067)
 22 steven.bauer@lw.com
 23 Amit Makker (Bar No. 280747)
 24 amit.makker@lw.com
 25 Shannon D. Lankenau (Bar. No. 294263)
 26 shannon.lankenau@lw.com
 27 **LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**
 28 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: 415.391.0600
 Facsimile: 415.395.8095

Melissa Arbus Sherry (*pro hac vice*)
 melissa.sherry@lw.com
 Richard P. Bress (*pro hac vice*)
 rick.bress@lw.com
 Anne W. Robinson (*pro hac vice*)
 anne.robinson@lw.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Tyce R. Walters (*pro hac vice*)
tyce.walters@lw.com
Gemma Donofrio (*pro hac vice*)
gemma.donofrio@lw.com
Christine C. Smith (*pro hac vice*)
christine.smith@lw.com
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
555 Eleventh Street NW, Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.637.2200
Facsimile: 202.637.2201

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs National Urban League;
League of Women Voters; Black Alliance for
Just Immigration; Harris County, Texas; King
County, Washington; City of San Jose,
California; Rodney Ellis; Adrian Garcia; and
the NAACP*

Dated: December 16, 2020

By: /s/ Jon M. Greenbaum
Kristen Clarke (*pro hac vice*)
kclarke@lawyerscommittee.org
Jon M. Greenbaum (Bar No. 166733)
jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org
Ezra D. Rosenberg (*pro hac vice*)
erosenberg@lawyerscommittee.org
Ajay Saini (*pro hac vice*)
asaini@lawyerscommittee.org
Maryum Jordan (Bar No. 325447)
mjordan@lawyerscommittee.org
Pooja Chaudhuri (Bar No. 314847)
pchaudhuri@lawyerscommittee.org
**LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL
RIGHTS UNDER LAW**
1500 K Street NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: 202.662.8600
Facsimile: 202.783.0857

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs National Urban League;
City of San Jose, California; Harris County,
Texas; League of Women Voters; King County,
Washington; Black Alliance for Just
Immigration; Rodney Ellis; Adrian Garcia; the
NAACP; and Navajo Nation*

Wendy R. Weiser (*pro hac vice*)
weiserw@brennan.law.nyu.edu
Thomas P. Wolf (*pro hac vice*)
wolft@brennan.law.nyu.edu
Kelly M. Percival (*pro hac vice*)
percivalk@brennan.law.nyu.edu
BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

120 Broadway, Suite 1750
New York, NY 10271
Telephone: 646.292.8310
Facsimile: 212.463.7308

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs National Urban League;
City of San Jose, California; Harris County,
Texas; League of Women Voters; King County,
Washington; Black Alliance for Just
Immigration; Rodney Ellis; Adrian Garcia; the
NAACP; and Navajo Nation*

Mark Rosenbaum (Bar No. 59940)
mrosenbaum@publiccounsel.org
PUBLIC COUNSEL
610 South Ardmore Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90005
Telephone: 213.385.2977
Facsimile: 213.385.9089

Attorneys for Plaintiff City of San Jose

Doreen McPaul, Attorney General
dmcpaul@nndoj.org
Jason Searle (*pro hac vice*)
jasearle@nndoj.org
**NAVAJO NATION DEPARTMENT OF
JUSTICE**
P.O. Box 2010
Window Rock, AZ 86515
Telephone: (928) 871-6345

Attorneys for Navajo Nation

Dated: December 16, 2020

By: /s/ Danielle Goldstein
Michael N. Feuer (Bar No. 111529)
mike.feuer@lacity.org
Kathleen Kenealy (Bar No. 212289)
kathleen.kenealy@lacity.org
Danielle Goldstein (Bar No. 257486)
danielle.goldstein@lacity.org
Michael Dundas (Bar No. 226930)
mike.dundas@lacity.org
**CITY ATTORNEY FOR THE CITY OF
LOS ANGELES**
200 N. Main Street, 8th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Telephone: 213.473.3231
Facsimile: 213.978.8312

Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Los Angeles

1
2 Dated: December 16, 2020

By: /s/ Michael Mutalipassi
Christopher A. Callihan (Bar No. 203010)
legalwebmail@ci.salinas.ca.us
Michael Mutalipassi (Bar No. 274858)
michaelmu@ci.salinas.ca.us
CITY OF SALINAS
200 Lincoln Avenue
Salinas, CA 93901
Telephone: 831.758.7256
Facsimile: 831.758.7257

Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Salinas

8
9 Dated: December 16, 2020

By: /s/ Rafey S. Balabanian
Rafey S. Balabanian (Bar No. 315962)
rbalabanian@edelson.com
Lily E. Hough (Bar No. 315277)
lthough@edelson.com
EDELSON P.C.
123 Townsend Street, Suite 100
San Francisco, CA 94107
Telephone: 415.212.9300
Facsimile: 415.373.9435

Rebecca Hirsch (*pro hac vice*)
rebecca.hirsch2@cityofchicago.org
**CORPORATION COUNSEL FOR THE
CITY OF CHICAGO**
Mark A. Flessner
Stephen J. Kane
121 N. LaSalle Street, Room 600
Chicago, IL 60602
Telephone: (312) 744-8143
Facsimile: (312) 744-5185

Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Chicago

21
22 Dated: December 16, 2020

By: /s/ Donald R. Pongrace
Donald R. Pongrace (*pro hac vice*)
dpongace@akingump.com
Merrill C. Godfrey (Bar No. 200437)
mgodfrey@akingump.com
**AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD
LLP**
2001 K St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202) 887-4000
Facsimile: 202-887-4288

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Gila River Indian
Community*

Dated: December 16, 2020

By: /s/ David I. Holtzman
David I. Holtzman (Bar No. 299287)
David.Holtzman@hklaw.com
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
Daniel P. Kappes
Jacqueline N. Harvey
50 California Street, 28th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 743-6970
Fax: (415) 743-6910

Attorneys for Plaintiff County of Los Angeles

ATTESTATION

I, Sadik Huseny, am the ECF user whose user ID and password authorized the filing of this document. Under Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), I attest that all signatories to this document have concurred in this filing.

Dated: December 16, 2020

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

By: /s/ Sadik Huseny
Sadik Huseny